



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

lieving that war is not to be thought of, now or at any other time, but that the friendship of this country—indeed, of all countries—is to be assiduously cultivated. That is what every responsible American residing in Japan, or who has visited the country, has been continually trying to impress upon us. Dr. Eliot's independent testimony to this attitude of Japan is of great value just at this time. In China, also, he found the universal peace idea more and more prevailing since the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty.

Secondly, Dr. Eliot mentions three factors which he thinks will determine the progress of the peace movement on its practical side. First of these is the adjustment of the present unrestrained commercial competition for trade areas. It is out of this, in his judgment, that naval rivalry among the commercial nations largely arises. If England, Japan, Germany, and France would enter into an agreement not to interfere with commercial trade routes, there would be no further reason for the navies. It will be most interesting to see how Dr. Eliot will further develop this important idea in his report. We hope that he will outline clearly what he thinks may be done to bring about such an agreement among the commercial powers, for that is the crux of the whole situation.

The second factor is the problem of the elimination of the friction brought about by the migrations of people to strange lands, where they form colonies or scatter themselves about heedlessly, and thus give ground for social antagonism and disturbance. He believes that some of the most serious evils of migration may be avoided if men going abroad would take wives with them, and thus have the benefits of domestic restraint. The migration of males from any one country should not, in his opinion, exceed that of females more than 5 per cent. The intermarrying of different races presents a great problem. People should be educated in regard to these things, and intermarriage among certain races should be prohibited. The problem here stated by Dr. Eliot has had little serious consideration, and we hope that his report will set it forth in such a way as to induce the governments of the countries where these evils have so much prevailed to make a thorough and exhaustive study of the subject.

The third important factor in the problem of peace, as viewed by Dr. Eliot, is the question of the exemption of private property from capture at sea in time of war. If this doctrine, which has been advocated by the United States almost from the beginning, were incorporated into international law, he believes that there would be no further need for the tremendous armament which the nations now have to support, and that the governments would be much more ready to agree to limitation and reduction. With this position in regard to the exemption of private property from capture at sea in time

of war nearly all of the leading pacifists have always agreed, but unfortunately it has not been possible, because of the steady opposition of England, to get anything accomplished in this direction. All the efforts put forth by the United States and other powers at The Hague in 1907 to secure such an agreement failed.

All these suggestions of Dr. Eliot are of the utmost importance, but they do not by any means cover the whole field, and we shall expect to see other features of the problem dealt with by him in his report.

Dr. Eliot has been criticised for having said to the Eastern countries that the time has not yet come for disarmament or even for limitation and reduction of armaments. We doubt if the reports which have reached us have fully represented his position. From the interviews and reports which we have seen he appears to feel very deeply the situation which the great and burdensome armaments of the time have produced. What he seems to us to have meant is that actual reduction of armaments is impracticable until the governments can be brought to enter into some such agreement as that above outlined. Upon this position there is little criticism to offer, provided it is not made an excuse to uphold and foster the current naval rivalry. This rivalry is almost universally felt to be the greatest evil of the time, "a satire on civilization," as it has been characterized by the British Prime Minister. The friends of peace, therefore, should everywhere and always insist that the time for arresting this rivalry has fully come, and that the powers should take up the question without delay. In season and out of season this demand should be pressed home to them, until they are compelled by the weight of public sentiment to find a way of relief from the wasting pestilence of armaments which is growing steadily every year more and more deadly and exhausting. The measures which Dr. Eliot thinks would, if adopted, sweep away the demand for the big armaments will never be enacted by the governments into law until the afflicted inhabitants of the different countries say that it must be done. Then it will be found to be extremely easy.

The Progressive Party on Peace.

The declaration of the new Progressive party, in its platform adopted at Chicago the 7th of August, in regard to arbitration, peace, and battleships, does not differ in any essential respects from that of the Republican party. It is as follows:

"The Progressive Party deplores the survival in our civilization of the barbaric system of warfare among nations, with its enormous waste of resources even in time of peace, and the consequent impoverishment of the life of the toiling masses. We pledge the party to use its best endeavors to substitute judicial and other peaceful means of settling international differences.

"We favor an international agreement for the limitation of naval forces. Pending such agreement, and as the best means of preserving peace, we pledge ourselves to maintain for the present the policy of building two battleships a year."

One could wish that, instead of adding the pledge to maintain for the present the policy of building two battleships a year, the Progressive platform-makers had had the insight and courage to add the logical sequence of their admirable declaration in regard to an international agreement for the limitation of naval forces, viz., "and we pledge ourselves to do everything in our power to bring about such an agreement at the earliest possible day." That would have given the party a truly progressive plank on which to stand. The two-battleship rider is retrogressive. The party has thereby pledged itself to a policy in regard to battleships which, if it by any chance should ever come into power, would neutralize very largely its desires and efforts in the direction of limitation of naval forces. The addition of two battleships a year to the navy will make the big-navy plague more and more difficult to extirpate. Big battleships and the spirit out of which friendly agreements and peace come have nothing in common.

International Students' Convention at Göttingen.

The growth of international sentiment and of international organization among the students of the German universities in the last two years is something noteworthy. The German universities have for half a century been pre-eminently the resort of students from all nations; but the international movement itself has become strong in Germany more recently than in the other great nations, for the reason undoubtedly that Germany is herself a new nation in the modern sense. There is much ground, however, for thinking that now that the movement has once taken strong hold of the scholars and youth of Germany, its development there may be more rapid and more thorough than anywhere else; and the significance of this for the family of nations would certainly be very great. The exchange professorships at Berlin, the international influence of such men as Professor Lamprecht and Professor Ostwald at Leipsic, and the rapid extension throughout all Germany of the new Society for Völkerverständigung, inspired and controlled largely by professors in the various universities, have undoubtedly done much to affect the thought and feeling of the great student body; but it is really a young American scholar, Dr. George W. Nasmyth, of Cornell University, carrying on his higher studies in Germany, who has given the direct impulse leading to the organization in several universities of international clubs like those already existing in some thirty of our own American universities. Young Nasmyth was the leading spirit in the great Cosmopolitan Club at Cornell, which now has 300 members, and, carrying his enthusiasm to Germany, he prompted the organization of an international club among the Berlin students, which quickly

attained a membership of two hundred. Similar clubs have been established through his initiative in Leipsic, Munich, and Göttingen, and the last week in July there was held in Göttingen a general convention of students from all of these clubs, to discuss the various aspects of the international movement and perfect plans for larger activities in the German universities, in several other of which efforts looking to the formation of international clubs are already under way. The program of this Göttingen students' convention, which has just come to hand here, is most interesting. The social side of things has good emphasis, excursions as far as to Cassel and Eisenach being included; but the striking thing about the program is the serious and definite work for the development of internationalism among the students which it outlines. To Americans the choice of Göttingen as the place for such an international convention is doubly interesting, because it was to Göttingen that American students first repaired in considerable numbers when the movement of our students to the German universities began, now nearly a century ago. It is with Göttingen that the names of Everett, Ticknor, Bancroft, Cogswell, Longfellow, and Motley are all associated. There is prominent reference to these American associations with Göttingen in the program of the recent convention, and the issue of the Göttingen students' journal, which comes at the same time, contains a thorough and most interesting article by Dr. Nasmyth, surveying the development of the international students' movement, which it is to be hoped may be put into English and given circulation here, for we have seen no better account of what is certainly one of the most promising movements of the time.

Editorial Notes.

The Geneva Peace Congress. The dispatches from Geneva say that big preparations are in progress for the Nineteenth International Peace Congress, which is to open there on the 23d of this September and continue during the week. By that time the rush of tourist travel will be over, and "the entire community is laying itself out to give the hundreds of delegates a bumper time in the 'playground of Europe.'" A specially attractive entertainment and excursion program is in preparation. We are sorry that, because of the lateness of the date, the attendance of delegates from the United States will be very much reduced. Several of the peace societies in this country have appointed delegates, but most of them cannot be in Europe so late. Hon. Richard Bartholdt, of the House, and Hon. Theodore E. Burton, of the Senate, have both gone over to attend the Interparliamentary Conference, which opens on the 18th, but neither of them expects to be able to stay for the Peace Congress. Among those who will attend the congress from this side are Dr. James L. Tryon, secretary of the Massachusetts Peace Society; Mr. William H. Short, secretary of the New York Peace Society; Mrs. Andrews, secretary of the American School Peace League; Mrs. Violet